

# Phase II and Phase III Project Cover Sheet

All information contained within the individual site database and inventory sheets is solely the work of the researchers and authors noted below. The data provided has been culled from the original site reports noted below and in many cases has been lifted directly from them with little or no editing. The database and inventory sheets are meant to serve as a synopsis of the report findings and a finding aid and are not intended to replace or republish the research of the authors noted below.

## REPORT INFORMATION:

2005 Shellenhamer, J. et. al.  
A Phase II Archeological Evaluation of Sites 18BA470, 18BA526, 18BA531, 18BA536, and 18BA538 within Areas 2, 5, and 9 of the 1,000-acre± A. V. Williams Trust Property located between Bird River Road and Leland Avenue in Baltimore County, Maryland.  
Submitted to Middle River Business Center, LLC

## Research Firm/Institution:

Archeological Testing and Consulting, Inc.  
12025 Remington Drive  
Silver Spring, MD 20902

Library ID No: 97002573

Catalog/Shelving ID: BA 179

## Sites examined:

18BA470	18BA526	18BA531	18BA536	18BA538
NRHP Eligible: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/>	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/>	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/>	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Justification</a>	<a href="#">Justification</a>	<a href="#">Justification</a>	<a href="#">Justification</a>	<a href="#">Justification</a>

## Project Details:

Phase I	<b>Project Justification:</b>  This report describes the 2005 Phase II evaluation of 13.8 acres of a 1,000 acre tract which was slated for development of a new business campus. One of the 5 sites that make up the 13.8 acres was known to exist on the parcel since 1999, but the others were identified through Phase I survey associated with the same business campus. The archeological evaluation of these five sites was connected with the application for a wetlands permit through the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Maryland Department of the Environment. Thus, the evaluation was required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended). Each of these sites was determined to be threatened by the (then) proposed development of the property.
Phase II <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Phase III	

<b>Project Objectives:</b>  -Determine if any of these sites are unique and/or have research value.  -Ascertain whether any of these sites lie in soils with stratigraphic integrity.  -Determine if any of these sites contain intact cultural features.  -Assess whether any of the sites are significant.  -Based on National Register Criterion (d), determine if any of these sites is eligible for listing on the NRHP.
---

MAC Accession: 2005.022

## Research Potential:

The Phase II research at 18BA470 revealed that very well-reserved artifact deposits were present in the northeastern portion of the site. This was precisely where the yards and structures associated with the earliest occupation of the site were situated. The outlying west and southern areas of the site, by contrast, had clearly been impacted by plow action and were not considered to be intact. Based on these findings, the 2005 researchers recommended that the northeastern portions of 18BA470 be preserved for future research and avoided during construction of the business campus or subject to a Phase III data recovery. MHT concurred with this opinion and determined that the site was eligible for listing on the NRHP. No Phase III has been carried out to date.

No intact masonry or other architectural features were identified during Phase II work at 18BA526. However the presence of so much domestic and architectural material suggests that substantial residence was once present. It was thought likely that the site represents an extension of nearby site 18BA517 where a possible structure was encountered. Based on the quantity and nature of the artifacts, the residence was thought to have been occupied for several generations. The nature of the ceramic assemblage suggests that site occupants were middle income planters. The research potential of this site is dramatically reduced by the lack of soils with good stratigraphic integrity and apparent displacement of the artifacts recovered. If this was the yard of a residence at 18BA517, plowing over the century that followed site abandonment obliterated the potential of 18BA526 to provide significant information related to the occupants of the Vanness/Howell farmstead.

The research potential of 18BA531 was dramatically reduced by the lack of soils with good stratigraphic integrity and displaced artifact recovery. Apparently, the extensive history of agriculture in this area dramatically impacted the yards connected with this early residence, leaving the soil completely disturbed. Thus, conducting future excavations at Site 18BA531 was thought to provide little additional research value beyond that already obtained through the evaluation process.

The research potential of Site 18BA536 was dramatically reduced by a lack of soils with good stratigraphic integrity, and displaced artifacts recovery. The extensive history of agriculture on the property dramatically impacted the yards connected with this early residence, leaving the soils completely disturbed. The only location to have good stratigraphic integrity was within the cellar hole (Feature 1). Thus, conducting future excavations at Site 18BA536 are unlikely to provide additional research value beyond that already obtained through Phase II testing.

The historic assemblage from 18BA538 suggests a small, short-term, domestic occupation. This view was supported by the limited recovery of domestic and architectural materials. The residence was likely occupied between 1790 and 1840, based on the presence of creamware, pearlware, whiteware, Jackfield, and Albany-slip stoneware. Those occupying the site area were likely tenant farmers or care-takers based on the paucity of artifacts. The research potential of the site is dramatically reduced by a lack of soils with good stratigraphic integrity, minor and displaced artifact recovery, and an absence of intact cultural features. The site should not be considered a significant archeological resource.